Human Events *A Weekly Analysis for the American Citizen*

Editorial Office 1710 Rhode Island Ave., N. W., WASHINGTON 6, D. C. *Telephone* NATIONAL 2066

VOL. VIII, No. 10, *Issue Number* 371 ,MARCH 7, 1951 ★ *Editor:* FRANK C. HANIGHEN

LOSING THE RACE FOR ARMED FRIENDS

by William Henry Chamberlin

Whether we are winning or losing the not-so-Cold War with the Soviet Union is a matter of legitimate debate. The evidence is not all available. Against the formidable expansion of the Soviet Eurasian Empire one may set a visible decline of indigenous Communism in the countries of Western Europe and the defection of Tito's Yugoslavia from the Kremlin camp. Only a few top scientists and military men could hazard an informed guess as to which side has been making faster progress with atomic and other ultra-modern weapons. Whether Western Europe would fall to Stalin like a ripe apple, as pessimists fear, or whether Eastern Europe would burst into a ferment of revolt, as optimists hope -- these are questions which can only be definitely answered by the test of war.

However, there is one very important aspect of the Cold War which America, up to the present time, has clearly been losing. This is the race for armed friends, for allies able and willing to fight. If one would count up the non-Soviet soldiers who would march at Stalin's command (who have marched, in the Far East) one gets a figure of five or six million. The American score in this field is close to zero.

What makes this situation very ironical is that the Soviet Union has exploited its satellites mercilessly while arming them. In his latest book, "The New Soviet Empire" (Yale University Press), David Dallin estimates that "political imports" into the Soviet Union since the end of the war have amounted to a sum between twenty and thirty billion dollars. These "political imports" might be less euphemistically described as what the Soviet Union has stolen by means of reparations, commercial deals in which Soviet goods are priced high and satellite goods are priced low, mixed companies, through which the Soviet Union skims off the cream of industrial and raw materials production in Eastern Europe, etc.

During the same period the United States has spent a larger sum, if one counts ECA appropriations, UNRRA contributions, loans to Britain and friends, special appropriations for Germany and Japan, etc. But the military dividends from America's lavish investment have been virtually nil.

Copyright 1951 by HUMAN EVENTS, INC.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

It is only very recently that the vague sentimental handout philosophy of the Marshall Plan has given way to a more realistic martial plan, in the sense of trying to put arms in the hands of people who, as we hope, will use them on our side.

Yet even now, after the dismal bankruptcy of Roosevelt's policy of trying to appease and charm Stalin into good behavior, after the proved failure of every political decision of Teheran, Cairo, Yalta and Potsdam, we are very far from playing the intelligent balance-of-power politics which alone offers a good prospect of averting all-out war or winning it, if it comes. We are still the prisoners of many unrealistic wartime hates, prejudices, leftist clichés and illusions.

II

Stalin, in his military build-up of auxiliary forces, has followed the classical method of conquerors, from Alaric and Attila through Genghis Khan down to Napoleon and Hitler. His first concern has been to arm to the teeth every country under his direct or indirect control, regardless of what attitude that country took during the late war.

The Soviet Union was the sole source of armament and training for the North Korean Army which touched off the shooting phase of the Cold War by pouring across the 38th Parallel in June, 1950. The Soviet Union is now the chief source of arms for Communist China. All the Soviet European satellite states have been tied in most closely with the Soviet military machine. Poland, the largest and potentially the most rebellious of the satellites, has experienced the placing of its armed forces under a Soviet Marshal, Konstantin Rokossovsky.

The muster of Stalin's auxiliaries works out as follows: approximately four million soldiers in the Chinese Communist armies; some three or four hundred thousand North Koreans; over six hundred thousand men in uniform in Bulgaria, Rumania and Hungary, all of which countries have been rearmed well beyond permissible treaty limits; between half a million and a million in Poland and Czechoslavakia. The Soviet regime has even built up, along with a more numerous armed police, a regular military force, the Bereitschaften, in East Germany. Present strength of the Bereitschaften is apparently over one hundred thousand, and they are trained in the use of heavy modern weapons.

This method of creating satellite forces backfired once, in the case of Yugoslavia. But it worked very effectively in the Orient, where a large part of the American combat army has been drawn into action in Korea without committing a single Soviet soldier, except a few advisers and operators of jet planes.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The method has worked fairly well in the case of other conquerors -- so long as they were winning. Alaric, Attila, Genghis Khan would incorporate in their barbarian armies the remnants of beaten enemy tribes and nations. The Grande Armée which Napoleon lost in Moscow was largely composed of non-French auxiliaries, drawn from many European countries. The advantage of keeping one's own military forces intact and bleeding one's opponent by satellite harassment is great and obvious.

III

The United States accomplishment in building up auxiliary military strength in friendly foreign countries deserves a rating of zero. The vivid and painful proof of this was the stripping of our available military reserves to meet the attack of a minor Soviet satellite in Korea.

Had there been a wise, farsighted policy of building up armed allies on the spot it would never have been necessary to commit American ground forces in Korea at all. We had three opportunities to utilize friendly Oriental armed forces and we muffed each one of them.

First, if we wanted to hold South Korea (which is an important shield for Japan) it was inexcusably negligent not to give the South Koreans a fighting chance to defend themselves by organizing south of the 38th Parallel a Korean Army equivalent in numbers and equipment to the army which the Russians trained and equipped north of the Parallel.

Second, the rearming of Japan under some kind of defense treaty assuring American air and naval support should have been vigorously taken in hand as soon as the Cold War began to heat up. There is something cruelly ironical in the spectacle of Americans and a limited number of British and Europeans carrying the brunt of the war in Korea while the immense pool of trained military manpower in Japan is untouched.

Third, the Nationalist army of Chiang Kai-shek, largest anti-Communist Oriental military force now in existence, has been kicked around and neglected and given no opportunity to start a second front in South China, even after the Chinese Communists launched all-out war against General MacArthur's army in Korea.

If one turns to Europe the story of neglected opportunities is equally dismal. We have talked a good deal about arming the West Germans and accomplished, as of this moment, exactly nothing. The Russians have talked not at all about arming those East Germans whom they consider politically reliable. And they have accomplished a good deal.

After the war there were hundrds of thousands of men of military age and training, most reliable politically, Poles, Balts, Ukrainians, Russians, who had fled from tyranny in their homelands. Many of these

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

would have been willing recruits for an American foreign legion, which would have considerably increased our striking power in troubled areas. There has been sporadic talk about organizing such a legion. But nothing has been done.

IV

Neither extreme isolationism nor extreme interventionism is calculated to meet the needs of the present crisis. The extreme isolationist is inclined to underrate the permanent danger to our free Society of letting Stalin's huge militarized empire build up an overwhelming preponderance of subjugated manpower and economic resources against us.

The extreme interventionist shuts his eyes to the impossibility of having America act as policeman for the whole world and as a fireman always on call to put out a blaze that may break out anywhere from Korea to Yugoslavia. (And there are some expert incendiaries in Moscow.)

Our foreign policy up to the present time, with its flagrant neglect of many opportunities for building up auxiliary armed strength (a technique in which Stalin has shown himself a master) seems to combine the worst features of extreme isolationism and extreme interventionism. It leaves us dependent almost entirely on our own strength and at the same time obligated to stretch our military resources impossibly thin.

It is high time to emancipate ourselves from unrealistic sentimental slogans. The important thing, in judging a country's eligibility for military aid, is not whether its government deserves a perfect certificate on that somewhat vague and disputable word, democracy. It is whether the government and the people concerned possess the will and the ability to resist Communist aggression. We certainly should not be deterred from trying to negotiate a mutual defense agreement with West Germany by the clamor of those who are still fighting the last war. We should not be swerved from a policy of giving aid to Chiang Kai-shek and the Chinese anti-Communist guerrillas because Prime Minister Nehru (whose contribution to the Korean war has been limited to defeatist backseat driving) might not approve.

The score on auxiliary armed strength today is a reproach to the realism and resourcefulness of American diplomacy. We should anchor ourselves firmly to the principle that in the long run Asia can be held against Communism only by Asiatics, Europe by Europeans. When we begin to wage and win a few wars by proxy and touch off a few subversion jobs behind the Iron Curtain, then, and not until then, we can feel that the Cold War tide is running in our favor.

Quotation up to a paragraph is permitted with credit to HUMAN EVENTS. For reproduction or more extensive quotation address requests to HUMAN EVENTS, 1710 Rhode Island Avenue, N. W., Washington 6, D. C. Trial subscription, three months for $3. Six months, $5.50. One year, $10. Two years, $18. Domestic airmail (including APO and FPO) one year, $12.00; foreign (regular mail) one year, $11. Foreign airmail rates on request. Please remit in U.S.A. DOLLARS. Allow two weeks for new subscriptions or change of address to become effective.

Application for entry as second-class matter is pending.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Not Merely Gossip *A Supplement to* Human Events Vol. VIII, No. 10

MAR 15 '51

By Frank C. Hanighen March 7, 1951

TRUMAN IN '52: Will Mr. Truman refuse to run for re-election next year? Reading many of the stories by Washington columnists, one gets the impression that the President, tiring of the burdens of office, has privately decided against running. This view, it should be pointed out, is not unanimously accepted by political observers.

Another group of observers look at the matter differently. They concede that, if international and national affairs prove an intolerable burden to the President in the next twelve months, his health might conceivably collapse and he would have to retire. However, short of that eventuality, the pressures on him to seek renomination would prove irresistible. For the entire "crony" element would strive desperately to keep him in the White House.

This element, of supreme importance in the Administration set-up, would fight to the last against retirement of their leader for at least two powerful reasons. (1) They would want to continue in their jobs and to enjoy the fruits thereof. (2) They would shrink from facing the public accounting of their stewardship (under the kleig lights of Congressional investigation) which would inevitably follow a change in Administration.

* * * * *

NAVAL COMMAND: The uproar in Britain over the naming of an American to command the North Atlantic waves has concealed a clever maneuver on the part of the British Defense Chiefs. U.S. Admiral William M. Fechteler, now Commander of the U.S. Atlantic Fleet, was appointed (by the defense ministers of the Allied states) to serve as Commander-in-Chief of the North Atlantic naval command, with a rank equal to that of Eisenhower. Immediately, the announcement set off furious protests in the British Parliament, with Winston Churchill's voice leading the tumult. While most of the American foreign correspondents stressed the "affront to British naval pride" as the reason for the noisy protests, some American observers of defense problems give quite a different version.

The storm in the British Parliament -- they say -- had been stimulated as a "diversion" to cover up and make easier the naming of a Britisher to a far more important post in the North Atlantic Defense organization. No one knew this better than Churchill, it was emphasized, even when he was oratorically complaining that the British had conceded the top land command to Eisenhower, but should not concede the top sea command. Actually, American observers say, there has been a lively fight behind the scenes in the Pentagon over the proposed appointment of a British officer to a post of far greater power than that held by Fechteler. The post is that of Chief of Intelligence of the whole European Army, and General T. S. Airey of the British Army has just been named to fill it.

To the average civilian, this appointment means little. But, for the American military observer with vast experience in Intelligence in joint army operations during the last war, it spells British control of "the eyes and brains" of the whole strategy of the European defense system. While U.S. officers are scheduled to serve under the British General, the appointment would mean that the British attitude would be decisive in evaluating intelligence, and therefore would shape the whole series of top decisions of Eisenhower's command. It is significant that French military are disturbed about this appointment.

In short, as our informants say, the British military chiefs naturally did not discourage the "fuss over Fechteler", deeming it an excellent trading concession.

Copyright 1951 by HUMAN EVENTS, INC.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Under cover of this controversy, the British were able to clinch the far more important post of Intelligence Command. There are, indeed, wheels within wheels in the organization of the projected European Army.

* * * * *

TREASURY AND FEDERAL RESERVE: It looks as if the Treasury and the Federal Reserve Board have made some sort of move to resolve their famous conflict. There is as yet no evidence that the two parties have settled the crucial point, the maintenance or unpegging of the level of the Government bond market. But the rather obscure announcement over the week end does suggest that some effort at settlement is going on. If that be so, one might find a good reason for, and impetus behind, the gesture in the "Daily Statement of the United States Treasury" for February 27. The record for that day shows that the sales of savings bonds came to $371 million. But it also shows that the total of matured and redeemed savings bonds amounted to $512 millions. Reflection on this disparity might well have prompted the Treasury, at least, to make some effort to get together with the Federal Reserve Board.

* * * * *

HOOVER: The reverberations of Mr. Herbert Hoover's testimony of last week still roll through the lobbies and cloakrooms of Congress. His statement and his answers to questions made a lasting impression, even on those who still oppose his views. We talked with a Senator whose own ideas of over-all strategy are quite different from those of Hoover. The Senator did not conceal his admiration of the cogency of the Hoover arguments and the economic and technical data which the former President reeled off to support his points. In Congress, there has been no little "post-mortem" discussion of the Hoover testimony, and one remark by the ex-President has stirred some speculation. In Washington Hoover passed the remark that the four divisions promised by the Department of Defense for Europe is "only the beginning".

Some members of Congress, who enjoy good sources of information in the Pentagon, say this view of "only the beginning" jibes with what they hear from that quarter. They gather that the Pentagon outlined a strategy to deal with the sending of troops, as follows: first Marshall was to announce plans for sending four divisions, and General Bradley was to lend him support; after public acceptance of the dispatch of troops to Europe on this small scale was obtained by this publicity, later (when available) more divisions would be sent, but with no public announcement nor official confirmation. Divisions would continue to cross the Atlantic up to the number which "the secret verbal agreement requires". What that ultimate number is, no one on the Hill professes to know.

This strategy of "only four divisions" has not proved entirely successful. For one thing, General Bradley was a little too disarmingly frank when he explained that the four would enable the two occupation divisions (already there) to escape better if the Russians should move west. It was hardly an inspiriting remark. Additionally, the furtive nature of the strategy has not escaped the notice of many members of Congress, and this gives unexpected vitality to the Wherry resolution and to the Lawrence Smith declaration on foreign policy in the House.

* * * * *

STRATEGY OF COMMITTEES: There is a rumor that the House Un-American Activities Committee may invite Professor Louis Budenz to serve as the Committee's chief investigator. Budenz, now a Fordham University professor, was once an important Communist; after leaving the Party, he exposed its conspiratorial activities in two books, many magazine articles and before committees investigating Communist activities. Whether true or not, the rumor has spurred much discussion as to this famous Committee's present status and future.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The fact is that appointment of such a prominent investigator as Budenz might well be an attempt to rehabilitate the low esteem in which the House Committee has fallen in the past two years. On Capitol Hill, the Committee is known as "The Deadwood Committee" -- so dubbed after Chairman John S. Wood (Ga.) who has hardly shown himself as energetic in his duties as some former Chairmen, such as Martin Dies and Parnell Thomas. Observers have felt that, in the past two years, the Committee has been the complete captive of the Administration (which it had never been in former years) and that majority members prevented any investigations which might prove embarrassing to the Administration. It must be recalled that the Hiss case was exposed in 1948, when the Committee was under the domination of Republicans. In the past two years, the Committee Counsel, Mr. Frank Tavenner, has been regarded as the man of Assistant Attorney General Peyton Ford and Ford's policy has been one of taking no risks so far as the Administration's reputation was concerned.

The proposal (we learn there has actually been such a suggestion among Democratic members of the Committee) to name Professor Budenz undoubtedly springs from two developments: (1) The resignation from the Committee staff of investigator Ben Mandel, who has had a long reputation for aggressiveness (his fine work on the Hiss case is remembered); and (2) the formation of the new "Internal Security" sub-Committee of the Senate Judiciary Committee under the implacable Senator McCarran. The latter new body is regarded as having a "tough" membership and an aggressive staff (which Mr. Mandel has now joined); and there is every likelihood that it will "go to town" on various sensitive cases and situations. In short, the creation of the McCarran probe group has probably spurred the House group into a desire to at least give a semblance of activity. Whether Professor Budenz will care to accept a position with the House Committee, without an understanding that he be given an entirely free hand, remains to be seen.

Those who have been watching this developing competition between the old House Committee and the new Senate sub-Committee are not unmindful that the "strategy of committees" has a much broader scope. They have not overlooked the role of the Kefauver Committee which has been probing crime, vice and gambling throughout the nation. The origin of this latter Committee was pretty obvious; it was started during the last election campaign and one of its objectives was clearly to divert public interest from the charges of Republicans, such as Senator McCarthy, that the Administration was protecting subversives. There was no indication that the Kefauver group met with any success in this role, but it did attract much attention.

Since the election, it has been kept going, probably for much the same reasons. Will its future revelations "blanket" smoke and fire proceeding from the McCarran probe? The answer cannot be offered now. But another question is being propounded: Will its exposures of gangsterism and race-wire syndicates prove sensational enough to distract public attention from Administration appeasement moves in the international scene? It is remarked that such a technique of "diversion" has been used before. Journalists in the post-World War I era were convinced that French Premier Clemenceau deliberately exploited the famous Landru murder case in order to divert public attention from the deals then going on at the Versailles Peace Conference.

* * * * *

ANOTHER SPENCE BILL: Totalitarians never quit. Two years ago, almost to a day, Representative Brent Spence (Democrat, Kentucky), and Chairman of the important House Banking and Currency Committee, threw into the hopper a bill called the "Economic Stability Act of 1949". As HUMAN EVENTS characterized it at the time, it was no less than a blueprint for National Socialism, and we dubbed it "In Stalin's Footsteps". It may be recalled that one of its intentions was to allow the Federal Government wide latitude to go into business for itself in such key industries as steel. Due to alert debunking at the time, and to opposition of certain Southern Democrats, the bill died aborning. But, Brother Spence is patient; or rather the Fair Deal

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

clique of brain-trusters in the bureaucracy which uses this member of Congress as a legislative agent, was patient. For they have found the present war emergency propitious for another attempt.

Spence has come forward with a new bill, "To assist the provision of housing and community facilities and services required in connection with the national defense." In the name of "national defense" (who could oppose so noble a purpose?), Spence proposed to give the President authority to "find", in any area or locality where defense activities are proceeding, an insufficiency of housing and community services, and to engage in the business of filling the gap. Stripped of its 62 pages of legislative verbiage, the bill (if passed) would make it possible for the President to declare either Detroit or some remote spot in the Mojave desert a good location for a monster workers' housing development. This would include not only the housing itself, but also schools for the children (to learn all about the benefits of government), day-care centers for the benefit of canasta-playing mothers, hospitals, libraries, cinemas and, of course, all the requisite public utilities -- streets, sewers, police stations, fire houses, etc. In fact, such a law would enable the Administration to create wards, villages, towns, or even great metropolitan cities. But why stop there?

* * * * *

STATES RIGHTS REVOLT -- IN INDIANA: The legislature of the Hoosier state is in rebellion against Washington, D. C., federal costs, controls and subsidies. Is it true that nobody bucks a handout? Well, it's not true in Indiana. The State Senate has passed a bill to open up relief rolls to the press and county prosecutors so that chiselers could be combed out. It seems that since the Federal Government came into the welfare picture, Indiana's costs have gone up 4,300 per cent. Out in Indianapolis, it is remarked that the state legislators are willing to risk losing from $15,000 to $19,000 million a year in federal relief funds by this resolution.

The Chicago Daily News, reporting the incident, indicates that this revolt has broad scope. "The Hoosier legislators who spearhead the drive say they are staking down a beachhead for states' rights in America". The Republican floor leader, Sen. John W. Van Ness asserted that "Indiana taxpayers poured more than one billion dollars into the federal coffers in 1950 and got back less than 5 per cent of that total." Mr. Van Ness roared, "Is there anything fair or just about that?" Well, that was in the Senate. In the Indiana House, there has been passed a resolution, "serving notice on the Congress of the United States that the people of Indiana were fed up with subsidies, doles and paternalism". Whatever the outcome of this rebellion in Indiana, the above development does suggest an explosive possibility: a real states' rights movement may grow when the several state legislatures realize that they cannot get back from Washington as much as their citizenry send in. Since the citizens send it in under the income tax law, the battle cry might be: abolition of the Sixteenth Amendment.

* * * * *

CATALYTIC AGENT: "Americanism" is one word that seems impervious to the ravages of semanticism. It holds up simply because its definition is written indelibly in the Declaration of Independence. So long as the Declaration's "self-evident" truths command high respect in American life, there is no effective way of twisting "Americanism" into some other meaning -- as has been done with "democracy", "freedom", etc. Moreover, the "self-evident" truths rest on the concept of a Creator. Where else could they come from? Essentially, then, Americanism is religious in content, and America is a religious country. That is the point of an interesting little book by Clarence Manion, Dean of the College of Law of Notre Dame University (published by the Heritage Foundation, 75 Wacker Drive, Chicago. $1.40). The thought is well worth re-examining at this juncture in American life.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED